

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated January 25, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed. Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 55-66 and 71-74 include allowable subject matter.

In the OA, claims 42, 44-48, 50, 52, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by JP 2001-356353 to Satoshi. Claims 43, 67-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Satoshi in view of U.S. Patent 6,129,804 to Gaynes.

The rejection of claims 42-74 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 42-74 are allowable over the cited references at least for the reason that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, “moving the upper chamber unit and the upper stage, aligning the first and second substrates; contacting the first and second substrates with a sealant material; venting the sealed interior space to apply pressure to the first and second substrates contacted by the sealant material, wherein, after the venting, the first and substrates are bonded together”.

None of the cited references including Satoshi and Gaynes, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. The structure of claim 42 of the present invention is different from the Satoshi structure in that Satoshi does not disclose or suggest “moving the upper chamber unit and the upper stage to align the first and second substrates”. Satoshi discloses that the XY theta stage T1 corresponding to the lower chamber and lower stage is moved to align the first and second substrates (see, Satoshi, paragraph [0037]). Thus, Satoshi discloses that the lower chamber and the lower stage are moved to align the first and second substrates, however Satoshi does not disclose or suggest “moving the upper chamber unit **and** the upper stage” as claim 42 requires (emphasis added). Gaynes does not supply this deficiency in Satoshi. Because Satoshi and Gaynes, considered separately or in combination do not disclose this feature of the invention recited in claim 42, claim 42 is allowable at least for this reason. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 42 and claims 43-74, which depend from claim 42, are allowable over the cited references.


Applicants believe the foregoing arguments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 25, 2006

By   
George G. Ballas  
Registration No. 52,587  
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant